## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Justin A. Johnson,

2:24-cv-02421-RFB-MDC

Plaintiff(s),

VS.

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO SEND EVIDENCE TO THE SUPREME COURT (ECF NO. 33)

Pastor R.A Vernon, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Plaintiff Justin A. Johnson filed a *Motion to Send Evidence to the Supreme Court* ("Motion") (ECF No. 33). The Court dismissed this case on 7/15/25 (ECF No. 32), but it appears that plaintiff filed the Motion the day before the Court dismissed the case. *See ECF No. 33, dated 7/14/25; but see docket entry, entered 7/15/25*. Plaintiff asks the Court in the heading of the Motion to send the evidence to Judge Joe Brown (apparently referring to a television personality) and not the Supreme Court of the United States. Even if this case were not closed, there is no authority to allow the Court to send plaintiff's case to a television judge. Plaintiff's Motion is **DENIED**. Plaintiff is directed not to file any additional motions into this now closed case.

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff Justin A. Johnson's *Motion to Send Evidence to the Supreme Court* (ECF No. 33) is **DENIED.** 

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: December 3, 2025

Hon. Maximiliano D. Convillier III United States Magistrata Judge

## **NOTICE**

Pursuant to Local Rules IB 3-1 and IB 3-2, a party may object to orders and reports and recommendations issued by the magistrate judge. Objections must be in writing and filed with the Clerk

1

2

3

4

1

5

7

8

6

9

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

2425

of the Court within fourteen days. LR IB 3-1, 3-2. The Supreme Court has held that the courts of appeal may determine that an appeal has been waived due to the failure to file objections within the specified time. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 142 (1985). This circuit has also held that (1) failure to file objections within the specified time and (2) failure to properly address and brief the objectionable issues waives the right to appeal the District Court's order and/or appeal factual issues from the order of the District Court. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153, 1157 (9th Cir. 1991); Britt v. Simi Valley United Sch. Dist., 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983). Pursuant to LR IA 3-1, plaintiffs must immediately file written notification with the court of any change of address. The notification must include proof of service upon each opposing party's attorney, or upon the opposing party if the party is unrepresented by counsel. Failure to comply with this rule may result in dismissal of the action.